arXiv:1401.7911v3 [math.NA] 25 Sep 2014

Spaces of generalized splines over T-meshes

Cesare Bracco[a] and Fabio Roman[a]

[a]Department of Mathematics "G. Peano"- University of Turin
V. Carlo Alberto 10, Turin 10123, Italy

Abstract

We consider a class of non-polynomial spline spaces over T-meshes, that is, of spaces locally spanned both by polynomial and by suitably-chosen non-polynomial functions, which we will refer to as generalized splines over T-meshes. For such spaces, we provide, under certain conditions, a dimension formula and a basis based on the notion of minimal determining set. We explicitly examine some relevant cases, which enjoy a noteworthy behaviour with respect to differentiation and integration; finally, we also study the approximation power of the just constructed spline spaces.

Keywords:T-mesh, generalized splines, dimension formula, basis functions, approximation power.

1 Introduction

The T-splines, first introduced in [15] and [16], represent a significant advancement in CAD and CAGD techniques, with relevant applications to differential problems, in particular in the framework of isogeometric analysis (see, e.g., [5] and [1]). The spline spaces over T-meshes are a closely related notion, first introduced by Deng et al. in [6] and further studied by the same authors and several others (see, e.g., [9], [10], [13] and [14]). The basic idea consists of considering spaces of spline functions which are polynomials of a certain degree in each of the cells of the T-mesh, which, unlike the classical tensor-product meshes, allows T-junctions, that is, vertices where only three edges meet.

This paper is devoted to the study of the *Generalized spline spaces over T-meshes*, a class of non-polynomial spline spaces, which essentially generalize the concept of spline space over a T-mesh: roughly speaking, they are locally spanned by polynomials and some suitable non-polynomial functions. The relevance of this class of spline spaces and some of the basic concepts related to it have been only recently discussed in some international conferences. The same kind of non-polynomial functions have been recently used also to construct non-polynomial T-splines (see, e.g., [3]), and non-polynomial hierarchical splines spaces (see [12]). The goal of this work is to carry out a rigorous and deep study of the class of Generalized splines over T-meshes, including general results about

the space dimension, the approximation power and noteworthy cases, which, as far as we know, are still missing in the literature. The introduction and the study of these non-polynomial spaces is justified by at least two reasons. First of all, the presence of non-polynomial functions allows to exactly reproduce certain shapes which can only be approximated by polynomial splines or NURBS (for example relevant curves like helices, cycloids, catenaries, or other transcendental curves). Moreover, as we will also point out in Section 4, choosing suitable non-polynomial functions also allows an easier computation of derivatives and integrals of certain surfaces with respect to using NURBS (see also [11], [7]).

Starting from some of the results obtained in [4] about a noteworthy class of univariate non-polynomial spaces, we define generalized spline spaces over T-meshes and construct a local representation in the Bernstein-Bézier fashion for their elements. For the above spaces we first provide the construction of a basis and a dimension formula by using the properties of the local Bernstein-Bézier representation and by generalizing to the non-polynomial case the techniques proposed for the polynomial one in [14].

Then, we show and discuss some noteworthy cases of generalized spline spaces over a T-mesh, which have a good behaviour w.r.t. differentiation and integration. Such a feature is very useful for the applications of the considered spaces, especially in the isogeometric analysis.

Moreover, we also study the approximation power of the just constructed spline spaces. In particular, we do it by constructing a quasi-interpolant based on some new local approximants, whose construction is not trivial. In fact, the results about the univariate non-polynomial Hermite interpolants given in [4] cannot be directly extended to the bivariate case. On the other hand, also the bivariate averaged Taylor expansions used in [14] cannot be simply adapted to the non-polynomial case we consider here. Therefore, we instead defined a new local Hermite interpolant belonging to the non-polynomial spline space, whose existence is proved by using certain assumptions made about the non-polynomial functions spanning the space, as carefully explained in Section 5. This approach allows us to get essentially the same approximation order as in the polynomial case.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 includes several preliminary arguments about the non-polynomial spaces we will use to define the new spline spaces, including some important properties about the derivatives of the basis functions and the basic concepts about T-meshes. Section 3 presents the new generalized spline spaces over T-meshes, and includes a detailed proof of the dimension formula and of the construction of the basis. Section 4 deals with the issue of suitable choices of the spaces in order to get a good behaviour of the spaces themselves w.r.t. differentiation and integration. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to the study of the approximation power of the constructed generalized spline space.

2 Preliminaries

The spaces we will consider are of the type

$$\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b]) := \text{span}\langle 1, s, ..., s^{n-3}, u(s), v(s)\rangle, \qquad s \in [a,b], \quad 3 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1}$$

where $u, v \in C^n([a,b])$; for $n=2$ we set

$$\mathcal{P}^2_{u,v}([a,b]) := \text{span}\langle u(s), v(s)\rangle, \qquad s \in [a,b].$$

We assume that $\dim\big(\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])\big) = n$; moreover, in order to prove some of the properties we are about to present, we will sometimes require the following additional conditions on $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$

$$\begin{aligned}\forall \psi \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b]),\ \text{if } \psi^{(n-2)}(s_1) = \psi^{(n-2)}(s_2) = 0, \quad s_1, s_2 \in [a,b],\ s_1 \neq s_2 \\ \text{then } \psi^{(n-2)}(s) = 0, \quad s \in [a,b];\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\forall \psi \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b]),\ \text{if } \psi^{(n-2)}(s_1) = \psi^{(n-1)}(s_1) = 0, \quad s_1 \in (a,b), \\ \text{then } \psi^{(n-2)}(s) = 0, \quad s \in [a,b].\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

In the following, we will explicitly mention when such conditions are needed.

2.1 Normalized positive basis and its properties

In this subsection we consider a normalized positive basis for the space $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$. The procedure to obtain it and its fundamental properties are known and can be found in [4]. Therefore here we will just recall the main results obtained in [4], omitting the proofs. We will instead prove Property 2.4, which will be crucial in order to obtain some results later in the paper.
In this Section we assume that the condition (2) holds.

The normalized positive basis can be constructed by using the following integral recurrence relation. By (2), there exist unique elements $U_{0,1,n-1}$ and $U_{1,1,n-1}$ belonging to $\text{span}\langle u^{(n-2)}, v^{(n-2)}\rangle$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}U_{0,1,n-1}(a) = 1, \quad U_{0,1,n-1}(b) = 0, \\ U_{1,1,n-1}(a) = 0, \quad U_{1,1,n-1}(b) = 1,\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and

$$U_{0,1,n-1}(s), U_{1,1,n-1}(s) > 0, \qquad s \in (a,b). \tag{5}$$

Moreover, we define, for $k = 2, ..., n-1$ and $n \geq 3$

$$\begin{aligned}&U_{0,k,n-1}(s) = 1 - V_{0,k-1,n-1}(s) \\ &U_{i,k,n-1}(s) = V_{i-1,k-1,n-1}(s) - V_{i,k-1,n-1}(s), \qquad 1 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ &U_{k,k,n-1}(s) = V_{k-1,k-1,n-1}(s),\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where

$$V_{i,k,n-1}(s) = \int_a^s U_{i,k,n-1}/d_{i,k,n-1} dt, \tag{7}$$

and

$$d_{i,k,n-1}(s) = \int_a^b U_{i,k,n-1} dt,$$

for $i = 0, ..., k$, $k = 1, ..., n-2$. Note that (4) and (5) hold also in the particular case $n=2$, and then $U_{0,1,1}$ and $U_{1,1,1}$ are a positive basis for $\mathcal{P}^2_{u,v}([a,b])$. The following results can be proved about the just defined functions.

Theorem 2.1. *For $k = 2, ..., n-1$ and $n \geq 3$, the set of functions $\{U_{0,k,n-1}, ..., U_{k,k,n-1}\}$ is a basis for the space*

$$span\langle 1, s, ..., s^{k-2}, u^{(n-k-1)}(s), v^{(n-k-1)}(s)\rangle.$$

Moreover, it is a normalized positive basis, that is, satisfies the conditions $\sum_{i=0}^{k} U_{i,k,n-1}(s) = 1$ and $U_{i,k,n-1}(s) > 0$ for $s \in (a,b)$, $i = 0, ..., k$.

Corollary 2.2. *The set of functions $\{U_{0,n-1,n-1}, ..., U_{n-1,n-1,n-1}\}$ is a normalized positive basis for the space $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$, $n \geq 3$, $U_{i,n-1,n-1} = B_{i,n-1}$, where $\{B_{i,n-1}\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} B_{i,n-1}(s) = 1$ and $B_{i,n-1}(s) > 0$ for $s \in (a,b)$, $i = 0, ..., n-1$. For $n = 2$, the set $\{U_{0,1,1}, U_{1,1,1}\}$ is a positive basis of $\mathcal{P}^2_{u,v}([a,b])$.*

Since in the case $n = 2$ we cannot, in general, guarantee the construction of a normalized positive basis, in the following we will assume $n \geq 3$. As a consequence of the results given in Sections 4 and 6 of [4], we get the following property.

Property 2.3. *For $i = 0, ..., k$, $k = 2, ..., n-1$ and $n \geq 3$, we have*

$$U^{(j)}_{i,k,n-1}(a) = 0, \qquad j = 0, ..., i-1,$$
$$U^{(j)}_{i,k,n-1}(b) = 0, \qquad j = 0, ..., k-i-1.$$

In particular, if we consider $k = n-1$, we have

$$B^{(j)}_{i,n-1}(a) = 0, \qquad j = 0, ..., i-1,$$
$$B^{(j)}_{i,n-1}(b) = 0, \qquad j = 0, ..., n-i-2.$$

Property 2.4. *For $k = 2, ..., n-1$ and $n \geq 3$, we have*

$$U^{(i)}_{i,k,n-1}(a) \neq 0, \qquad i = 0, ..., k-1,$$
$$U^{(k-i)}_{i,k,n-1}(b) \neq 0, \qquad i = 1, ..., k.$$

In particular, if we consider $k = n-1$, we have

$$B^{(i)}_{i,n-1}(a) \neq 0, \qquad i = 0, ..., n-2, \tag{8}$$
$$B^{(n-i-1)}_{i,n-1}(b) \neq 0, \qquad i = 1, ..., n-1. \tag{9}$$

Proof. First, let us prove (8) by induction. For $k = 2$, (8) holds, since from (4), (6) and (7) we get

$$U_{0,2,n-1}(a) = 1 - V_{0,1,n-1}(a) = 1 - \int_a^a U_{0,1,n-1}(t)/d_{0,1,n-1}dt = 1 - 0 = 1,$$
$$U^{(1)}_{1,2,n-1}(a) = D[V_{0,1,n-1}(s) - V_{1,1,n-1}(s)]_{s=a} = \frac{U_{0,1,n-1}(a)}{d_{0,1,n-1}} - \frac{U_{1,1,n-1}(a)}{d_{1,1,n-1}} = \frac{1}{d_{0,1,n-1}} - 0 \neq 0.$$

Now, if (8) holds for k, it must be true for $k+1$ as well, since we have

$$U_{0,k+1,n-1}(a) = 1 - V_{0,k,n-1}(a) = 1 - \int_a^a U_{0,k,n-1}(t)/d_{0,k,n-1}dt = 1 - 0 = 1,$$
$$U^{(i)}_{i,k+1,n-1} = \frac{U^{(i-1)}_{i-1,k,n-1}(a)}{d_{i-1,k,n-1}} - \frac{U^{(i-1)}_{i,k,n-1}(a)}{d_{i,k,n-1}} = \frac{U^{(i-1)}_{i-1,k,n-1}(a)}{d_{i-1,k,n-1}} \neq 0,$$

where we used (6), (7), Property 2.3 and the induction hypothesis. Analogously we can prove (9). □

Note that the above constructed basis is not only normalized positive, but it is also a Bernstein basis.

2.2 Some definitions on T-meshes

We will now recall the definition of T-mesh and of some related objects, using the notations of [14]. Note that the concept of T-mesh we will consider here may slightly differ from other ones in the literature, such as the more general used in [2], which allows the presence not only of *T-junctions*, but of *L-junctions* and *I-junctions* as well.

Definition 2.5. *A T-mesh is a collection of axis-aligned rectangles $\Delta = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^N$ such that the domain $\Omega \equiv \cup_i R_i$ is connected and any pair of rectangles (which we will call cells) $R_i, R_j \in \Delta$ intersect each other only at points on their edges.*



An example of T-mesh where $\Omega = [-1, 6] \times [-1, 5]$

Note that this definition does not imply that the domain Ω is rectangular and allows the presence of holes in it. Tensor-product meshes are a particular case of T-meshes. If a vertex v of a cell belonging to Δ lies in the interior of an edge of another cell, then we call it a *T-junction*.

Definition 2.6. *Given a T-mesh Δ, a line segment $e = \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle$ connecting the vertices w_1 and w_2 is called edge segment if there are no vertices lying in its interior. Instead,*

if all the vertices lying in its interior are T-junctions and if it cannot be extended to a longer segment with the same property, then we call it a composite edge.

In the following, we will consider T-meshes which are *regular* and have no *cycles*, in the sense of the following definitions (see [14] for more details).



An example of regular T-mesh.



An example of non-regular T-mesh.

Definition 2.7. *A T-mesh Δ is regular if for each of its vertices w the set of all rectangles containing w has a connected interior.*

Definition 2.8. *Let $w_1, ..., w_n$ be a collection of T-junctions in a T-mesh Δ such that w_i lies in the interior of a composite edge having one of its endpoints at w_{i+1} (we assume $w_{n+1} = w_1$). Then $w_1, ..., w_n$ are said to form a cycle.*



The sequence w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 is a cycle.

3 Spaces of generalized splines on T-meshes

In this Section, we define the spaces of generalized splines over T-meshes, and we study their dimension by constructing a basis. The results obtained can be considered a generalization to non-polynomial splines spaces over T-meshes of the ones proved in [14] for the basic polynomial case.

3.1 Basics

Let Δ be a regular T-mesh without cycles, and let $0 \leq r_1 < n_1 - 1$, $0 \leq r_2 < n_2 - 1$, where r_1, r_2, n_1, n_2 are integers and $n_1, n_2 \geq 2$. Later on, we will also use the notation $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2)$ and $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2)$. We define the *space of generalized splines over the T-mesh* Δ *of bi-order* $\mathbf{n}$ *and smoothness* $\mathbf{r}$ as

$$GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) = \{p(s,t) \in C^{\mathbf{r}}(\Omega) : p|_R \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{n}}_{u,v}(R) \ \forall R \in \Delta\}, \tag{10}$$

where $\Omega = \cup_{R\in\Delta} R$, $C^{\mathbf{r}}(\Omega)$ denotes the space of functions p such that their derivatives $D^i_s D^j_t p$ are continuous for all $0 \leq i \leq r_1$ and $0 \leq j \leq r_2$, and the space $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(R) = \mathrm{span}\langle g_1(s)g_2(t) : g_1 \in \mathcal{P}^{n_1}_{u_1,v_1}([a_R, b_R]),\ g_2 \in \mathcal{P}^{n_2}_{u_2,v_2}([c_R, d_R])\rangle, \tag{11}$$

with $R = [a_R, b_R] \times [c_R, d_R]$ and $u_1, v_1 \in C^{n_1}([a_R, b_R])$, $u_2, v_2 \in C^{n_2}([c_R, d_R])$ such that $\dim\big(\mathcal{P}^{n_1}_{u_1,v_1}([a_R, b_R])\big) = n_1$ and $\dim\big(\mathcal{P}^{n_2}_{u_2,v_2}([c_R, d_R])\big) = n_2$, and satisfying both (2) and (3). In other words, $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ is a space of spline functions which, restricted to each cell R, are products of functions belonging to spaces of type (1).

We introduce now on each cell R a Bernstein-Bézier representation for the elements of $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ based on the Bernstein basis of $\mathcal{P}^{n_1}_{u_1,v_1}([a_R, b_R])$ and $\mathcal{P}^{n_2}_{u_2,v_2}([c_R, d_R])$ constructed in Theorem 2.2; therefore, we need to assume that (2) is satisfied both by $\mathcal{P}^{n_1}_{u_1,v_1}([a_R, b_R])$ and $\mathcal{P}^{n_2}_{u_2,v_2}([c_R, d_R])$. Let us denote by $\{B^R_{i,n_1-1}\}^{n_1-1}_{i=0}$ and $\{B^R_{i,n_2-1}\}^{n_2-1}_{i=0}$ the Bernstein basis of, respectively, $\mathcal{P}^{n_1}_{u_1,v_1}([a_R, b_R])$ and $\mathcal{P}^{n_2}_{u_2,v_2}([c_R, d_R])$, to stress the dependence of the basis on the coordinates a_R, b_R, c_R, d_R of the vertices of the cell R. For any $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, we can then give on the cell R the following representation

$$p|_R(s,t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1} c^R_{ij} B^R_{i,n_1-1}(s) B^R_{j,n_2-1}(t), \tag{12}$$

where $c^R_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ are suitable coefficients. Let us define the set of *domain points associated to* R

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R} = \{\xi^R_{ij}\}^{n_1-1,n_2-1}_{i=0,j=0},$$

with

$$\xi^R_{ij} = \Big(\frac{(n_1-1-i)a_R + ib_R}{n_1-1}, \frac{(n_2-1-j)c_R + jd_R}{n_2-1}\Big), \qquad i = 0, ..., n_1-1,\ j = 0, ..., n_2-1.$$

We can then define the *set of domain points* for a given T-mesh Δ as

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta} = \bigcup_{R\in\Delta} \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R},$$

where we assume that multiple appearances of the same point are allowed. If we set

$$B^R_\xi(s,t) = B^R_{i,n_1-1}(s)B^R_{j,n_2-1}(t), \quad \text{where } \xi^R_{ij} = \xi,$$

then, for each $R \in \Delta$, we can re-write (12) in the more compact form

$$p|_R(s,t) = \sum_{\xi\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}} c^R_\xi B^R_\xi(s,t),$$

which we call *Bernstein-Bézier form*; we refer to the c^R_ξ as the *B-coefficients*. It is then clear that any element of the space $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ is completely determined by a set of B-coefficients $\{c_\xi\}_{\xi\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta}}$. Of course, not every choice of the B-coefficients corresponds to an element in the spline space, since smoothness conditions must be satisfied.

3.2 Smoothness conditions

In order to study the consequences of the smoothness conditions required for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ on the determination of the B-coefficients of an element of the space, first we need to recall some more concepts about domain points.

Let $R = [a_R, b_R] \times [c_R, d_R] \in \Delta$, $w = (a_R, c_R)$, and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ with $\mu_1 \le n_1 - 1$ and $\mu_2 \le n_2 - 1$. We call the set $\mathcal{D}^R_\mu(w) = \{\xi_{ij}\}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}_{i=0,j=0}$ the *disk of size μ around w*. The disks around the other vertices of R can be defined analogously. Moreover, we say that the points ξ^R_{ij} with $0 \le i \le \nu$ lie within a distance ν from the edge $e = \{a_R\} \times [c_R, d_R]$ and we use the notation $d(\xi^R_{ij}) \le \nu$. Analogous notations hold for the other edges of R.
Moreover, we can define the set of domain points

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu(w) = \bigcup_{R\in\Delta_w} \mathcal{D}^R_\mu,$$

where $\Delta_w \subset \Delta$ contains only the cells having w as one of their vertices and multiple appearances of a point are allowed in the union. Given a composite edge e, an edge $\tilde{e}$ lying on e and a vertex w of $\tilde{e}$, if $d(w, \tilde{e}) \le \nu$, then we write that $d(w, e) \le \nu$ as well.

The following lemma is a key step to be able to understand the influence of the smoothness conditions and to get a dimension formula for the space.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ and let w be a vertex of Δ. Let us consider two cells R and $\tilde{R}$ with vertices (in counter-clockwise order) w, w_2, w_3, w_4 and w, w_5, w_6, w_7, respectively. If the coefficients c_ξ, $\xi \in \mathcal{D}^R_{\mathbf{r}}(w)$ are given, then the coefficients c_η, $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{\tilde{R}}_{\mathbf{r}}(w)$ are uniquely determined by the smoothness conditions at w.*

Proof. We prove the lemma for the case where w is the upper-right corner of $R = [a_R, b_R]\times[c_R, d_R]$ and the lower-left corner of $\tilde{R} = [a_{\tilde{R}}, b_{\tilde{R}}]\times[c_{\tilde{R}}, d_{\tilde{R}}]$, that is, $w = (b_R, d_R) = (a_{\tilde{R}}, c_{\tilde{R}})$. First, let us consider the partial derivatives of $p|_{\tilde{R}}$

$$D_s^h D_t^k p|_{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}, c_{\tilde{R}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1} c_{ij}^{\tilde{R}} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(c_{\tilde{R}}), \qquad 0 \le h \le r_1,\ 0 \le k \le r_2.$$

Since by Corollary 2.2 $B_{i,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(s) = U_{i,n_1-1,n_1-1}(s)$ and $B_{j,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(t) = U_{j,n_2-1,n_2-1}(t)$, using Property 2.3 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}) &= 0, \qquad h < i \le n_1 - 1, \\ D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(c_{\tilde{R}}) &= 0, \qquad k < j \le n_2 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$D_s^h D_t^k p|_{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}, c_{\tilde{R}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{h}\sum_{j=0}^{k} c_{ij}^{\tilde{R}} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(c_{\tilde{R}}).$$

Now let us compute the partial derivatives of $p|_R$

$$D_s^h D_t^k p|_R(b_R, d_R) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1} c_{ij}^{R} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{R}(b_R) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{R}(d_R), \qquad 0 \le h \le r_1,\ 0 \le k \le r_2.$$

Since by Corollary 2.2 $B_{i,n_1-1}^{R}(s) = U_{i,n_1-1,n_1-1}(s)$ and $B_{j,n_2-1}^{R}(t) = U_{j,n_2-1,n_2-1}(t)$, using Property 2.3 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{R}(b_R) &= 0, \qquad 0 \le i < n_1 - 1 - h, \\ D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{R}(d_R) &= 0, \qquad 0 \le j < n_2 - 1 - k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$D_s^h D_t^k p|_R(b_R, d_R) = \sum_{i=n_1-1-h}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=n_2-1-k}^{n_2-1} c_{ij}^{R} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{R}(b_R) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{R}(d_R).$$

Requiring the $C^{\mathbf{r}}$ smoothness at w is then equivalent to the linear system composed of the equations

$$\sum_{i=0}^{h}\sum_{j=0}^{k} c_{ij}^{\tilde{R}} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(c_{\tilde{R}}) = \sum_{i=n_1-1-h}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=n_2-1-k}^{n_2-1} c_{ij}^{R} D_s^h B_{i,n_1-1}^{R}(b_R) D_t^k B_{j,n_2-1}^{R}(d_R), \tag{13}$$

for $h = 0, ..., r_1$, $k = 0, ..., r_2$.

Note that in this case we have $\{c_\xi\}_{\xi\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}^R(w)} = \{c_{ij}^R\}_{i=n_1-1-r_1, j=n_2-1-r_2}^{n_1-1,n_2-1}$, that is, the $(r_1+1)\times(r_2+1)$ B-coefficients associated to R given by hypothesis are exactly the ones on the right-hand of equations (13). Analogously, $\{c_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}^{\tilde{R}}(w)} = \{c_{ij}^{\tilde{R}}\}_{i=0,j=0}^{r_1,r_2}$, which means that the $(r_1+1)\times(r_2+1)$ B-coefficients associated to $\tilde{R}$ are the unknowns of the system (13). It is easy to observe that, if we organize the equations according to the order of

the derivatives, the matrix of the system is lower triangular. Moreover, the entries on the diagonal of the matrix, that is,

$$D_s^h B_{h,n_1-1}^{\tilde{R}}(a_{\tilde{R}}) D_t^k B_{k,n_2-1}^{\tilde{R}}(c_{\tilde{R}}), \qquad h = 0, ..., r_1,\ k = 0, ..., r_2,$$

are not zero because of Property 2.4. □

After having studied the influence of smoothness around a vertex, we now study the situation around edges. Given a composite edge e, we will use the following notation

$$r_e = \begin{cases} r_1, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ r_2, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal,} \end{cases}$$

$$D_e = \begin{cases} D_s, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ D_t, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal,} \end{cases}$$

$$n_e = \begin{cases} n_2, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ n_1, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal,} \end{cases}$$

$$u_e = \begin{cases} u_2, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ u_1, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal,} \end{cases}$$

$$v_e = \begin{cases} v_2, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ v_1, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, to get the following results we will assume that u_1, v_1 are such that for each horizontal edge segment $f = [a_f, b_f] \times \{c_f\}$

$$\dim \mathcal{P}_{u_1,v_1}^{n_1}([a_f, b_f]) = n_1, \tag{14}$$

and that u_2, v_2 are such that for each vertical edge segment $f = \{a_f\} \times [c_f, d_f]$

$$\dim \mathcal{P}_{u_2,v_2}^{n_2}([c_f, d_f]) = n_2, . \tag{15}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let e be a composite edge of Δ with endpoints w_1 and w_5, and let $p \in GS_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}(\Delta)$. For any $0 \le \nu \le r_e$, $D_e^\nu p|_e$ is a univariate function belonging to the space $\mathcal{P}_{u_e,v_e}^{n_e}([w_{1,e}, w_{5,e}])$, where $w_{1,e}, w_{5,e} \in \mathbb{R}$ are the abscissas/ordinates of w_1, w_5.*

Proof. The Lemma can be trivially proved with the same arguments used in [14] for the polynomial case, thanks to the assumptions (14) and (15). □

Let us now consider a cell R_e with vertices w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 and another cell $\tilde{R}_e$ with vertices w_5, w_6, w_7, w_8. Moreover we assume that w_2 and w_8 lie on e as well (the other cases are analogous). Let us use the notation

$$\mathcal{M}_e = \begin{cases} \left\{ \xi_{ij}^{R_e} \right\}_{i=0,j=r_2+1}^{r_1,n_2-r_2-2}, & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical,} \\ \left\{ \xi_{ij}^{R_e} \right\}_{i=r_1+1,j=0}^{n_1-r_1-2,r_2}, & \text{if } e \text{ is horizontal.} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

In other words, the set $\mathcal{M}_e$ includes all the domain points ξ lying outside the disks $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}^{R_e}(w_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}^{R_e}(w_2)$ and satisfying $d(\xi, e) \le r_e$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let e be an edge of the T-mesh Δ with endpoints w_1 and w_5, and let us assume that $\mathcal{P}^{n_e}_{u_e,v_e}([w_{1,e}, w_{5,e}])$ satisfies (2). If the B-coefficients of a spline $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ corresponding to the domain points belonging to the set*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_e = \mathcal{D}^{R^e}_{\mathbf{r}}(w_1) \cup \mathcal{D}^{\tilde{R}^e}_{\mathbf{r}}(w_5) \cup \mathcal{M}_e$$

are given, then the coefficient of p associated to domain points ξ such that $d(\xi, e) \leq r_e$ are uniquely determined.

Proof. We will suppose that e is horizontal (the case where e is vertical is analogous). We consider a cell R with an edge lying on e: let us assume, for instance that R has vertices z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 and that z_3 and z_4 lie on e, like in Figure 5 (see [14] for the corresponding polynomial case). We will show that the B-coefficients corresponding to the domain points ξ belonging to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}$ and such that $d(\xi, e) \leq r_2$ are uniquely determined.
Let $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$. First of all, since the B-coefficients corresponding to the domain points in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_e$ are given, we can compute the derivatives

$$\left\{D^i_s D^j_t p(w_1)\right\}^{n_1-r_1-2,r_2}_{i=0,j=0}, \qquad \left\{D^i_s D^j_t p(w_5)\right\}^{r_1,r_2}_{i=0,j=0}.$$

In fact, by Property 2.3, the computation of these derivatives involves just the B-coefficients contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_e$. Now, let us consider the smallest rectangle $\tilde{R}$ containing R and e (the rectangle with vertices $\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_5, w_5, w_1$ in Figure 5). Note that $\tilde{R}$ does not necessarily belong to the T-mesh Δ; however, since we assumed that $\mathcal{P}^{n_e}_{u_e,v_e}([w_{1,e}, w_{5,e}])$ satisfies (2), we can temporarily assume it does and consider the corresponding B-coefficients. In order to obtain the B-coefficients $c^{\tilde{R}}_{ij}$, $i = 0, ..., n_1 - 1$, $j = 0, ..., r_2$, associated to $\tilde{R}$, that is, the ones corresponding to domain points ξ in $\tilde{R}$ s.t. $d(\xi, e) \leq r_e$, it is sufficient to solve the linear systems

$$\begin{aligned} D^i_s D^j_t p|_{\tilde{R}}(w_1) &= D^i_s D^j_t p(w_1), \qquad i = 0, ..., n_1 - r_1 - 2 \quad j = 0, ..., r_2, \\ D^i_s D^j_t p|_{\tilde{R}}(w_5) &= D^i_s D^j_t p(w_5), \qquad i = 0, ..., r_1 \quad j = 0, ..., r_2, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where on the right side of the equality we have the already computed derivatives. Note that, by Properties 2.3 and 2.4, the matrices associated to these systems are both triangular with non-zero elements on the diagonal. From Lemma 3.2 we know that $p|_e \in \mathcal{P}^{n_e}_{u_e,v_e}([w_{1,e}, w_{5,e}])$; in particular, this allows us to state that

$$\begin{aligned} D^i_s D^j_t p|_R(w) &= D^i_s D^j_t p|_{\tilde{R}}(w), \qquad i = 0, ..., n_1 - r_1 - 2 \quad j = 0, ..., r_2, \\ D^i_s D^j_t p|_R(\hat{w}) &= D^i_s D^j_t p|_{\tilde{R}}(\hat{w}), \qquad i = 0, ..., r_1 \quad j = 0, ..., r_2, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for any two points w and $\hat{w}$ lying on e between z_4 and z_3. Let us choose $w = z_4$ and $\hat{w} = z_3$: we observe that the derivatives on the right side of equations (18) can be computed because we have enough B-coefficients of $p|_{\tilde{R}}$ (previously obtained solving (17)). Then, we get from (18) two linear systems where the unknowns are the B-coefficients c^R_{ij}, $i = 0, ..., n_1 - 1$, $j = 0, ..., r_2$, associated to the cell R, that is, the ones corresponding to domain points ξ in R s.t. $d(\xi, e) \leq r_e$. These systems can be solved, since the associated matrices are triangular and with non-zero elements on the diagonals (again because of Properties 2.3 and 2.4). Since the same procedure can be repeated for any cell with one edge lying on e, the Lemma is proved. □



the cells considered in the proof of Lemma 3.3 (see [14] for the analogous situation examined in the polynomial case).

3.3 Basis and dimension formula

We will prove the construction of the basis and a dimension formula for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ in the case $n_1 - 1 \geq 2r_1 + 1$ and $n_2 - 1 \geq 2r_2 + 1$. One of the main tools which we will need to prove the dimension formula is the concept of *minimal determining set*, introduced in [14] for the polynomial case.

Definition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta}$. $\mathcal{M}$ is a determining set for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ if for any spline function p belonging to $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$*

$$c_\xi = 0, \qquad \forall \quad \xi \in \mathcal{M} \quad \textit{implies} \quad p \equiv 0, \tag{19}$$

where for any $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$, c_ξ is the corresponding B-coefficient of p. If there is no smaller set satisfying this property, $\mathcal{M}$ is called a minimal determining set.

Using simple linear algebra tools, it is easy to verify that, for any determining set $\mathcal{M}$, $\dim\left(GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)\right) \leq \#\mathcal{M}$ and, for any minimal determining set $\mathcal{M}$, $\dim\left(GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)\right) = \#\mathcal{M}$.
Let us denote by J_{NT} and C the sets of vertices which are not T-junctions and the set of composite edges of Δ, respectively. For any w in J_{NT}, let R_w be a cell with an edge e_w with one endpoint at w, and such that any other edge with an endpoint at w has length at most equal to e_w. Moreover, let

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}_w = \mathcal{D}^{R_w}_{\mathbf{r}}(w), \qquad \text{for any } w \in J_{NT},\\
&\mathcal{M}_R = \left\{\xi^R_{ij}\right\}_{i=r_1+1,r_2+1}^{n_1-r_1-2,n_2-r_2-2}, \qquad \text{for any } R \in \Delta,\\
&\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{w\in J_{NT}} \mathcal{M}_w \cup \bigcup_{e\in C} \mathcal{M}_e \cup \bigcup_{R\in\Delta} \mathcal{M}_R,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_e$, $e \in C$, is defined by (16).

Lemma 3.5. *The subset of domain points $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta}$ is a determining set for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$.*

Proof. In order to prove the lemma is sufficient to show that (19) holds. Let $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ with $c_\xi = 0$ for any $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$. First of all, by hypothesis, for any $w \in J_{NT}$ $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_w = \mathcal{D}^{R_w}_{\mathbf{r}}(w)$, which implies, by Lemma 3.1, that $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}(w)$. As a consequence, we can state that for any composite edge e having both the endpoints in J_{NT} we have $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_e$, since by hypothesis $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_e$. Therefore, by using Lemma 3.3, we also obtain that $c_\xi = 0$ for all ξ such that $d(\xi, e) \leq r_e$. We will refer to the already considered vertices and edges as *already determined*. To determine the remaining B-coefficients we now use an iterative procedure consisting of two steps

1. for each T-junction w on an already determined composite edge, we can use Lemma 3.1 to show that $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}(w)$;

2. for each composite edge e with already determined endpoints w_1 and w_2, since $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_e$ by hypothesis and $c_\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}(w_1) \cup \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{r}}(w_2)$, because these two vertices are already determined, we can use Lemma 3.3 to show that $c_\xi = 0$ for all ξ such that $d(\xi, e) \leq r_e$.

Since we consider only T-meshes without cycles, this two steps can be repeated until all the vertices and all the edges are already determined. Then, at this point, we can state that all the B-coefficients corresponding to domain points within a distance r_e from any edge e are determined and are zero. The remaining coefficients are zeros as well, since they correspond to domain points whose distance from any edge e is greater than r_e, which are exactly the domain points contained in $\cup_{R\in\Delta}\mathcal{M}_R$. □

We are now able to provide the construction of a basis for the space and a dimension formula for the generalized spline spaces $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$. The logical scheme to get such results is similar to the one used in [14] for the polynomial spline case. Therefore we don't report the proofs.

Lemma 3.6. *For each $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a unique $\psi_\xi \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ such that*

$$\gamma_\eta \psi_\xi = \delta_{\xi,\eta}, \qquad \eta \in \mathcal{M},$$

where $\delta_{\xi,\eta}$ is the Kronecker delta and, for any $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta}$, $\gamma_\eta : GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ is the functional defined by

$$\gamma_\eta p = c_\eta, \qquad \text{with } c_\eta \text{ B-coefficient of } p \text{ associated to } \xi, \quad p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta). \tag{20}$$

Theorem 3.7. *The set $\mathcal{M}$ is a minimal determining set for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, the set $\{\psi_\xi\}_{\xi\in\mathcal{M}}$ is a basis for $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\dim\left(GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)\right) =& (r_1+1)(r_2+1)J_{NT} + (r_2+1)(n_1-2r_1-2)E_{hor} \\ &+ (r_1+1)(n_2-2r_2-2)E_{ver} + (n_1-2r_1-2)(n_2-2r_2-2)N,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
&J_{NT} = \textit{number of vertices of } \Delta \textit{ which are not T-junctions},\\
&E_{hor} = \textit{number of horizontal composite edges of } \Delta,\\
&E_{ver} = \textit{number of vertical composite edges of } \Delta,\\
&N = \textit{number of cells of } \Delta.
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 3.8. *Let* $\mathbf{n} = (n, n)$ *and* $\mathbf{r} = (r, r)$ *with* $n - 1 \geq 2r + 1$*; then*

$$\dim\left(GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)\right) = (r+1)^2 J_{NT} + (r+1)(n-2r-2)(E_{hor} + E_{ver}) + (n-2r-2)^2 N.$$

4 Noteworthy cases of generalized spline spaces

Given a T-mesh Δ, it is clear, from (10) and (11), that the corresponding generalized spline space $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ depends on the choice of the functions u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2. Some noteworthy choices are, for example, the trigonometric functions, that is, $u_1(s) = \cos(s)$, $v_1(s) = \sin(s)$, $u_2(t) = \cos(t)$, $v_2(t) = \sin(t)$, or the hyperbolic functions, that is, $u_1(s) = \cosh(s)$, $v_1(s) = \sinh(s)$, $u_2(t) = \cosh(t)$, $v_2(t) = \sinh(t)$, because of their properties to exactly reproduce certain shapes (conic sections, helices, cycloids, catenaries; see also [11]).

In particular in isogeometric analysis (see, e.g., [5] and [1]), it is of a certain interest to choose u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 such that the space of generalized splines over the T-mesh has a nice behaviour with respect to the fundamental derivation and integration operators, that is, such that the derivatives and integrals belong to spaces of the same type. Such a feature can be hardly formalized exactly, but in our case we can obtain some favourable cases by examining which spaces $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ satisfy the following conditions

$$\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \implies D_s\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{s},\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \tag{21}$$

$$\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \implies \int \psi(s,t)ds \in GS^{\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{s},\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \tag{22}$$

$$\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \implies D_t\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{t},\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{t}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \tag{23}$$

$$\psi(s,t) \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta) \implies \int \psi(s,t)dt \in GS^{\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{t},\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{t}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta), \tag{24}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{s} = (n_1 - 1, n_2)$, $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{s} = (n_1 + 1, n_2)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{t} = (n_1, n_2 - 1)$, $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\mathbf{t} = (n_1, n_2 + 1)$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{s} = (r_1 - 1, r_2)$, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{s} = (r_1 + 1, r_2)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{t} = (r_1, r_2 - 1)$, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\mathbf{t} = (r_1, r_2 + 1)$. Although we are dealing with spline spaces in two dimensions defined over a T-mesh, we can study this property in the univariate case over a single interval, because, in every cell, the function is a product between two functions depending just by one variable. Then, from now on we will consider the space $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$, $n \geq 2$, requiring that

$$\psi(s) \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b]) \implies \psi'(s) \in \mathcal{P}^{n-1}_{u,v}([a,b]) \tag{25}$$

$$\psi(s) \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b]) \implies \int \psi(s)ds \in \mathcal{P}^{n+1}_{u,v}([a,b]) \tag{26}$$

First of all, we note that it is not restrictive assuming that the derivatives of u and v are linear combinations of the two functions themselves. In fact, if we require that the derivative of u belongs to the space $\mathcal{P}^{n-1}_{u,v}([a,b])$, with $n \geq 3$, we can write it as $u'(s) = \alpha_1 \cdot u(s) + \alpha_2 \cdot v(s) + \alpha_3 \cdot P_{n-4}(s)$, where $P_{n-4}(s)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n-4$, obtained by differentiating the polynomial parts, of degree at most $n-3$, of u and v. However, we can assume without loss of generality that both u and v are free from polynomial parts of degree at most $n-3$, because, in the case they are not, the corresponding space $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$ would not change. Therefore, we can suppose $P_{n-4}(s) \equiv 0$ and, as a consequence, $u'(s) = \alpha_1 \cdot u(s) + \alpha_2 \cdot v(s)$. Similar remarks hold for v and for both the functions when considering integration.
When differentiating a function $\psi(s) \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$, the derivative of its polynomial part of course belongs to $\mathcal{P}^{n-1}_{u,v}([a,b])$. Therefore, condition (25) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} u'(s) = \alpha_1 \cdot u(s) + \alpha_2 \cdot v(s) \\ v'(s) = \beta_1 \cdot u(s) + \beta_2 \cdot v(s) \end{cases}$$

Following the classical theory of vector-valued ordinary differential equations, we can consider $A = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 \\ \beta_1 & \beta_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and compute its nonzero eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2, the associated eigenvectors $W_1 = \begin{bmatrix} w_{11} \\ w_{21} \end{bmatrix}$, $W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} w_{12} \\ w_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, and examine the possible cases.

- A **has distinct real eigenvalues**. In this case, the solutions are given by

$$\begin{cases} u(s) = c_1 w_{11} e^{\lambda_1 s} + c_2 w_{12} e^{\lambda_2 s} \\ v(s) = c_1 w_{21} e^{\lambda_1 s} + c_2 w_{22} e^{\lambda_2 s} \end{cases},$$

  where $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Having assumed the linear independence of u and v, necessarily we have $c_1 \neq 0, c_2 \neq 0$; without loss of generality for the space spanned by u and v, we can set

$$u(s) = e^{\lambda_1 s}, v(s) = e^{\lambda_2 s}$$

  A notable example arises if we set $\lambda_1 = c, \lambda_2 = -c$: we obtain the same space generated by $\cosh(cs)$, $\sinh(cs)$. The corresponding Bernstein-like basis with $c = 1$, constructed according to Corollary 2.2, is shown in Figures 6-7 for the cases $n = 3, 5$.



The Bernstein basis of $\mathcal{P}^3_{u,v}([0,1])$ *with* $u(s) = \cosh(s)$, $v(s) = \sinh(s)$.



The Bernstein basis of $\mathcal{P}^5_{u,v}([0,1])$ *with* $u(s) = \cosh(s)$, $v(s) = \sinh(s)$.

- A **has coincident eigenvalues, and it is diagonalizable**. The previous scheme for the solutions can be used, but, due to the fact that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, u and v cannot be linearly independent. So this case is not of our interest.

- A **has coincident eigenvalues, and it is not diagonalizable**. It corresponds, for our purposes, to $u(s) = e^{\lambda s}, v(s) = se^{\lambda s}$.

- A **has distinct complex conjugate eigenvalues**. If $\lambda_1 = \alpha + i\beta, \lambda_2 = \alpha - i\beta$, then
$$\begin{cases} u(s) = c_1 w_{11} e^{(\alpha+i\beta)s} + c_2 w_{12} e^{(\alpha-i\beta)s} \\ v(s) = c_1 w_{21} e^{(\alpha+i\beta)s} + c_2 w_{22} e^{(\alpha-i\beta)s} \end{cases}$$
Assuming the linear independence of u and v, for our goals it is equivalent considering
$$u(s) = e^{\alpha s}\cos(\beta s), v(s) = e^{\alpha s}\sin(\beta s)$$
For $\alpha = 0$, we obtain the trigonometric case $u_0(s) = \cos(\beta s), v_0(s) = \sin(\beta s)$. The corresponding Bernstein-like basis with $\beta = 1$, constructed according to Corollary 2.2, is shown in Figures 8-9 for the cases $n = 3, 5$.



The Bernstein basis of $\mathcal{P}^3_{u,v}([0, \pi/2])$ *with* $u(s) = \cos(s)$, $v(s) = \sin(s)$.



The Bernstein basis of $\mathcal{P}^5_{u,v}([0, \pi/2])$ *with* $u(s) = \cos(s)$, $v(s) = \sin(s)$.

It can be easily verified that each of the just obtained couples of u and v corresponds to spaces $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a, b])$ satisfying (26).

If (25) and (26) hold, (2) is verified for sure in some cases and conditionally in other ones, while (3) is always verified. By using standard linear algebra means, we obtain, specifically:

- $u(s) = e^{\lambda_1 s}, v(s) = e^{\lambda_2 s}$ with $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$: (2) and (3) are both verified for any choice of the parameters and of interval $[a, b]$;

- $u(s) = e^{\lambda s}, v(s) = se^{\lambda s}$: (2) and (3) are both verified for any choice of the parameters and of interval $[a, b]$;

- $u(s) = e^{\alpha s}\cos(\beta s), v(s) = e^{\alpha s}\sin(\beta s)$: (2) is verified if $\beta(b-a) < \pi$, while (3) is always verified.

Finally, we mention another possible choice of u and v (see, e.g., [4]) not satisfying the conditions (21) - (24), but anyway having a good behaviour with respect to differentiation and integration

$$u(s) = s^{m_0}, v(s) = (1-s)^{m_1}$$

where m_0 and m_1 are sufficiently large to guarantee the linear independence of the set $\{1, s, ..., s^{n-3}, s^{m_0}, (1-s)^{m_1}\}$.
Also note that all the choices of u, v considered in this section are suitable to construct spaces of generalized splines over a T-mesh (10) satisfying the conditions (14)-(15).

5 Approximation power

This section is devoted to the study of the approximation properties of the generalized spline spaces over T-meshes. More precisely, we will obtain the approximation order by a logical scheme similar to that one used in [14], but introducing a new suitable quasi-interpolant operator.
In fact, the local approximants used in [14], that is, the averaged Taylor expansions, cannot be simply generalized to our non-polynomial case. Moreover, also the results on the approximation power obtained in [4] for the univariate case, by using Hermite interpolation in spaces of type $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$, cannot be directly extended to the bivariate case, due to the difficulty to find a suitable differential operator and the corresponding Green's function needed to construct a non-polynomial Taylor expansion.
For these reasons, we adopt an alternative approach: we construct a bivariate Hermite interpolant belonging to the spline space, whose existence is rigorously proved by using the assumption (2) and (3). This also allows us to obtain an approximation order, which is essentially the same as in polynomial case.
Given a function $f \in C^{\mathbf{n}}(\Omega)$ and $(s_0, t_0) \in (a,b) \times (c,d)$, we define the interpolant $Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)(s,t)$ as the function satisfying the two following conditions

1. it belongs to $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}([a,b] \times [c,d])$,

2. its polynomial expansion of coordinate bi-degree $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1)$ coincides with the polynomial expansion of f of the same bi-degree, that is, $Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)(s,t)$ is a Hermite interpolant of coordinate bi-degree $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1)$.

Since $Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)$ is a Hermite interpolant, the Taylor expansion of the difference $f - Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)$ does not contain any term of degree smaller than or equal to k, where $k = \min\{n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1\}$, and then $\|f - Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)\| = O(h^{k+1})$, where $h = \mathrm{diam}([a,b] \times [c,d])$.

In order to show that $Q_L(f; s_0, t_0)(s,t)$ exists and is unique for any $f \in C^{\mathbf{n}}(\Omega)$ and $(s_0, t_0) \in [a,b] \times [c,d]$, let us write the explicit expressions of a generic element belonging

to $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}([a,b]\times[c,d])$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3} a_{ij}\frac{(s-s_0)^i}{i!}\frac{(t-t_0)^j}{j!}+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3} b_i\frac{(s-s_0)^i}{i!}u_2(t)+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3} c_i\frac{(s-s_0)^i}{i!}v_2(t)$$
$$+\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3} d_j u_1(s)\frac{(t-t_0)^j}{j!}+\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3} e_j v_1(s)\frac{(t-t_0)^j}{j!}$$
$$+\nu_1 u_1(s)u_2(t)+\nu_2 u_1(s)v_2(t)+\nu_3 v_1(s)u_2(t)+\nu_4 v_1(s)v_2(t)$$

and of its Taylor expansion of coordinate bi-degree (n_1-1,n_2-1)

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3} a_{ij}\frac{(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j}{i!j!}+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{b_i D_t^j u_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-3}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{c_i D_t^j v_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3}\frac{d_j D_s^i u_1(s_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-3}\frac{e_j D_s^i v_1(s_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\nu_1\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\nu_2\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\nu_3\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j$$
$$\textstyle+\nu_4\sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1}\frac{D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)}{i!j!}(s-s_0)^i(t-t_0)^j.$$

Then, the condition requiring that $Q_L(f;s_0,t_0)$ is a Hermite interpolant of coordinate bi-degree (n_1-1,n_2-1) corresponds to the following equations

$$a_{ij}+b_i D_t^j u_2(t_0)+c_i D_t^j v_2(t_0)+d_j D_s^i u_1(s_0)+e_j D_s^i v_1(s_0)+\nu_1 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)$$
$$+\nu_2 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)+\nu_3 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)+\nu_4 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)=D_s^i D_t^j f(s_0,t_0),$$

for $0\le i\le n_1-3$, $0\le j\le n_2-3$,

$$b_i D_t^j u_2(t_0)+c_i D_t^j v_2(t_0)+\nu_1 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)$$
$$+\nu_2 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)+\nu_3 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)+\nu_4 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)=D_s^i D_t^j f(s_0,t_0),$$

for $0\le i\le n_1-3$, and $j=n_2-2,n_2-1$,

$$d_j D_s^i u_1(s_0)+e_j D_s^i v_1(s_0)+\nu_1 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)$$
$$+\nu_2 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)+\nu_3 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)+\nu_4 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)=D_s^i D_t^j f(s_0,t_0),$$

for $i=n_1-2,n_1-1$, $0\le j\le n_2-3$, and

$$\nu_1 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)+\nu_2 D_s^i u_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)$$
$$+\nu_3 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j u_2(t_0)+\nu_4 D_s^i v_1(s_0)D_t^j v_2(t_0)=D_s^i D_t^j f(s_0,t_0),$$

for $i=n_1-2,n_1-1$, $j=n_2-2,n_2-1$. By using a suitable reordering of the unknowns $a_{ij},b_i,c_i,d_j,e_j,\nu_k$, we obtain a linear system whose matrix is

$$A=\begin{bmatrix} I & \star & \star & \star\\ 0 & A_1 & 0 & \star\\ 0 & 0 & A_2 & \star\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A_3\end{bmatrix}$$

where I is the identity matrix of size $(n_1-2)(n_2-2)\times(n_1-2)(n_2-2)$, $\star$ stands for blocks of suitable size, 0 stand for null matrices of suitable size, and

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 & D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 & D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & \dots & 0 & 0 & D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & \dots & 0 & 0 & D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & 0 & 0 & \dots & D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & 0 & 0 & \dots & D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0) & \dots & 0 & 0 & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0) & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0) & \dots & 0 & 0 & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0) & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0) & 0 & 0 & \dots & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0) \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0) & 0 & 0 & \dots & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) \\ D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) \\ D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) \\ D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0)D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

The matrix A_1 has size $2(n_1-2)\times 2(n_1-2)$, A_2 has size $2(n_2-2)\times 2(n_2-2)$, A_3 has size 4. The existence and uniqueness of the interpolation operator Q_L is then equivalent to the non-singularity of this matrix. Since A is an upper triangular block matrix, its non-singularity can be proved by studying A_1, A_2, A_3 (I is obviously non-singular). The matrices A_1 and A_2 are not singular, due to their structure, and the fact that (2) and (3) hold. In fact, the determinants of A_1 and A_2 are

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(A_1)| &= |D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0)D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) - D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0)D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0)|^{n_1-2} \\ |\det(A_2)| &= |D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0)D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0) - D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0)D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0)|^{n_2-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it can be easily verified that determinant of A_3 is $-[\det(D_1)]^2[\det(D_2)]^2$, where

$$D_1 := \begin{bmatrix} D_s^{n_1-2}u_1(s_0) & D_s^{n_1-2}v_1(s_0) \\ D_s^{n_1-1}u_1(s_0) & D_s^{n_1-1}v_1(s_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$D_2 := \begin{bmatrix} D_t^{n_2-2}u_2(t_0) & D_t^{n_2-2}v_2(t_0) \\ D_t^{n_2-1}u_2(t_0) & D_t^{n_2-1}v_2(t_0) \end{bmatrix} .$$

If we assume that (3) holds, it can be shown (see [4]) that $\det(D_1)\neq 0$ and $\det(D_2)\neq 0$, and so $\det(A_3)\neq 0$.

In the following, in order to prove the approximation properties, we will also assume that there is a lower bound for the norm of the determinant of A (see also the remarks at

the end of the Section). Note that this assumption is guaranteed in the cases where the nonpolynomial functions are $e^{\lambda_1 s}$ and $e^{\lambda_2 s}$, $e^{\lambda s}$ and $se^{\lambda s}$, and $e^{\alpha s}\cos(\beta s)$ and $e^{\alpha s}\sin(\beta s)$, examined in Section 4.

Given a function $f \in C^{\mathbf{n}}(\Omega)$, we now define the following quasi-interpolant belonging to the generalized spline space $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$

$$Qf = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{M}} \gamma_\xi(Q_L(f; s_\xi, t_\xi))\psi_\xi$$

where

- $\mathcal{M}$ is the minimal determining set constructed in (34);
- ψ_ξ are the elements of the basis of the spline space on the T-mesh Δ associated to $\mathcal{M}$;
- γ_ξ are the linear functionals defined in (20) that associate to a spline $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ the correspondent B-coefficients, needed to express p as a linear combination of the basis ψ_ξ:
$$p = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{M}} \gamma_\zeta p \, \psi_\zeta, \qquad \forall p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$$
- (s_ξ, t_ξ) is the center of the biggest circle included in the rectangle R_ξ, which is a cell containing ξ. Note that such a point lies in the interior of R_ξ, allowing the construction of $Q_L(f; s_\xi, t_\xi)$.

Note that Q is a linear operator, being the functionals γ_ξ linear, and it is a projection onto $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, that is, $Qp = p$ for every $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$. In the following, we will use the generalization to our non-polynomial setting of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 in [14].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$. Let $R \in \Delta$, and let $p|_R = \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}} c^R_\eta B^R_\eta(s,t)$. We denote by c the vector containing all the coefficients c^R_η, $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}$. Then, there exists a constant K_1, depending only on n_1 and n_2, such that*

$$\frac{||c||_\infty}{K_1} \leq ||p||_R \leq ||c||_\infty,$$

where $||c||_\infty$ stands for the max*-norm of c and $||\cdot||_R$ for the* sup*-norm of a function restricted to R.*

Proof. This is a straightforward generalization of the polynomial case: the upper bound follows from the fact that the basis functions are nonnegative and sum to one, while the lower bound follows from the following argument: the matrix $M := [B^R_\eta(\zeta)]_{\zeta,\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}}$ is a non-singular matrix, since the functionals $\{\lambda_\zeta\}_{\zeta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}}$, defined by $\lambda_\zeta(f) = f(\zeta)$, $f \in C^0(R)$, are a dual basis of $\{B^R_\eta\}_{\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}}$. Then $Mc = r$, where r is the vector $\{p(\zeta)\}_{\zeta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}}$. As a consequence, we have

$$||c||_\infty \leq ||M^{-1}r||_\infty \leq ||M^{-1}||_\infty ||r||_\infty \leq ||M^{-1}||_\infty ||p||_R = K_1 ||p||_R.$$

The result is then achieved by setting $K_1 = ||M^{-1}||_\infty$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Given a rectangle R, let A_R be its area. Then there exists a constant K_2, depending only on n_1 and n_2, such that*

$$\frac{A_R^{1/q}}{K_2}||c||_q \leq ||p||_{q,R} \leq A_R^{1/q}||c||_q,$$

where $||c||_q$ stands for the q-norm of the vector c and $||\cdot||_{q,R}$ for the q-norm of a function restricted to R.

Proof. It is sufficient to use equivalence of norms on finite dimensional spaces, considering that both a classical polynomial space and the more general space in which we work have finite dimension. Then, the results is obtained, for any $1 \leq q < \infty$, by generalizing Theorem 2.7 in [8]. □

To prove the approximation property of the quasi-interpolant, we will need the following result about the minimal determining set and the B-coefficients.

Definition 5.3. *Let e be a composite edge of Δ, and let $e_1, ..., e_m$ be a maximal sequence of composite edges such that for each $i = 1, ..., m$, one endpoint of e_i lies in the interior of e_{i+1}, where we assume $e_{m+1} = e$. We call $e_1, ..., e_m$ a chain ending at e. We call m the length of the chain.*

Theorem 5.4. *For every composite edge e consisting of m edge segments $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ with $m \geq 1$, let $\alpha_e := \max\{|e|/|e_1|, |e|/|e_m|\}$, and let β_e be the length of the longest chain ending on e. For each rectangle R in Δ, let κ_R be the ratio of the lengths of its longest and of its shortest edges. Recalling that C is the set of all composite edges of Δ, we set $\alpha_\Delta := \max_{e\in C} \alpha_e, \beta_\Delta := \max_{e\in C} \beta_e, \kappa_\Delta := \max_{R\in\Delta} \kappa_R$. Then, for any $p \in GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, its associated B-coefficients satisfy*

$$|c_\eta| \leq K_3 \max_{\xi\in\mathcal{M}} |c_\xi|, \qquad \eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},\Delta}$$

where K_3 is a constant depending only on $\mathbf{n}, \alpha_\Delta, \beta_\Delta, \kappa_\Delta$.

Proof. The proof essentially is a generalization of Theorem 6.1 in [14], since analogous relations between the directional derivatives of a spline belonging to $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$ can be found. □

Remark. Let us define, for any cell R in Δ:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_R &= \{\xi \in \mathcal{M} : \sigma(\psi_\xi) \cap R \neq \emptyset\}, \\ \Omega_R &= \cup_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} \sigma(\psi_\xi), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma(\psi_\xi)$ denotes the support of ψ_ξ. Note that, if $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}$, then

$$|c_\eta| \leq K_3 \max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} |c_\xi| \tag{27}$$

since it can be shown that the coefficients corresponding to the domain points $\xi \in \mathcal{M}\backslash\Gamma_R$ do not have influence on the coefficients of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}$.

Let $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ and $F \in C^{\mathbf{n}}(\Omega)$. By applying Lemma 5.2 with $p = Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)$, we obtain that $c = \gamma_\xi(Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi))$ and

$$|\gamma_\xi(Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi))| \leq \frac{K_2}{A_{R_\xi}^{1/q}} ||Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)||_{q,R_\xi}.$$

If we denote by $T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)$ the Taylor expansion of $Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)$ at (s_ξ, t_ξ) of bi-degree $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1)$, for $1 \leq q < \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_\xi(Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi))| &\leq \frac{K_2}{A_{R_\xi}^{1/q}} ||Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)||_{q,R_\xi} \leq \frac{K_2}{A_{R_\xi}^{1/q}} A_{R_\xi}^{1/q} ||Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)||_{\infty,R_\xi} \\ &\leq K_2 \max_{(s,t)\in R_\xi} |T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(F, s_\xi, t_\xi)(s,t)| + O((\operatorname{diam}(R_\xi))^{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $k = \min\{n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1\}$. An analogous bound can be obtained for $q = \infty$ by using Lemma 5.1.
For $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}$, by using Theorem 5.4 and (27), we have

$$|\gamma_\eta| \leq K_3 \max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} |\gamma_\xi| \leq K_2 K_3 \max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} \max_{(s,t)\in R_\xi} |T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)(s,t)| + O((\max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} \operatorname{diam}(R_\xi))^{k+1})$$

That allows us to obtain a limitation for QF

$$\begin{aligned} ||QF||_{q,R} &\leq A_R^{1/q} ||QF||_{\infty,R} = A_R^{1/q} \left|\left| \sum_{\eta\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{n},R}} \gamma_\eta B_\eta^R \right|\right|_{\infty,R} \\ &\leq A_R^{1/q} K_2 K_3 \max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} \max_{(s,t)\in R_\xi} |T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(F; s_\xi, t_\xi)(s,t)| \\ &+ O((\max_{\xi\in\Gamma_R} \operatorname{diam}(R_\xi))^{k+1}). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Now, we can finally get an approximation result for the quasi-interpolant Q. Given a cell $R_\zeta \in \Delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ||f - Qf||_{q,R_\zeta} &\leq ||f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta)||_{q,R_\zeta} + ||Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta) - Qf||_{q,R_\zeta} \\ &= ||f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta)||_{q,R_\zeta} + ||Q(f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta))||_{q,R_\zeta} \\ &\leq O((\operatorname{diam}(R_\zeta))^{k+1}) \\ &+ A_{R_\zeta}^{1/q} K_2 K_3 \max_{\xi\in\Gamma_{R_\zeta}} \max_{(s,t)\in R_\xi} |T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta); s_\xi, t_\xi)(s,t)| \\ &+ O((\max_{\xi\in\Gamma_{R_\zeta}} \operatorname{diam}(R_\xi))^{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that Q is linear and it is a projection on $GS^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}(\Delta)$, and we applied inequality (28) to $F = f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta)$. Since $|D_s^i D_t^j \big(f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta)\big)| = O\big(\|(s,t) - (s_\zeta, t_\zeta)\|^{\max\{0,k+1-i-j\}}\big)$ (for $0 \leq i \leq n_1 - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq n_2 - 1$), and $\|(s_\xi, t_\xi) - (s_\zeta, t_\zeta)\| \leq \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_{R_\zeta})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|T^{(n_1-1,n_2-1)}Q_L(f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta); s_\xi, t_\xi)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1} |D_s^i D_t^j \big(f - Q_L(f; s_\zeta, t_\zeta)\big)|_{(s_\xi,t_\xi)} (s - s_\xi)^i (t - t_\xi)^j = O((\operatorname{diam}(\Omega_{R_\zeta}))^{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it can be proved that there exists a constant K_4, depending only on $\alpha_\Delta, \beta_\Delta, \kappa_\Delta$, such that $\text{diam}(\Omega_R) \leq K_4 \text{ diam}(R)$ for any $R \in \Delta$. Then, we get

$$||f - Qf||_{q,R_\zeta} \leq O((\text{diam}(R_\zeta))^{k+1}) + O((\text{diam}(\Omega_{R_\zeta}))^{k+1}) = O((\text{diam}(R_\zeta))^{k+1})$$

Then, if we define the *mesh size* of Δ as $H = \max_{R\in\Delta} \text{diam}(R)$, we obtain ;

$$||f - Qf||_{q,R_\zeta} \leq O(H^{k+1})$$

Remark. This approximation order has been obtained assuming that (2) and (3) are satisfied: in fact this allows to construct the local Hermite interpolants $Q_L(f; s_\xi, t_\xi)$. Moreover, we assumed that there is a lower bound for the norm of the determinant of the matrix A, which guarantees that the constants involved in the study of the approximation order are bounded. Such conditions are fulfilled in the cases where the nonpolynomial functions are $e^{\lambda_1 s}$ and $e^{\lambda_2 s}$, $e^{\lambda s}$ and $se^{\lambda s}$, and $e^{\alpha s}\cos(\beta s)$ and $e^{\alpha s}\sin(\beta s)$, examined in Section 4. Note that, under analogous assumptions (2) and (3), it is possible to construct a univariate version of the Hermite interpolation operator Q_L, with approximation order n. In other words, for any $f \in C^n([a,b])$ and $s_0 \in (a,b)$, we can obtain $Q_L(f; s_0) \in \mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$ satisfying

$$D^k_s Q_L(f; s_0)(s_0) = D^k_s f(s_0), \qquad k = 0, ..., n-1, \tag{29}$$

and such that $|f - Q_L(f; s_0)| = O(h^n)$, where $h = |s - s_0|$.
This is not in contrast with the approximation results obtained in [4] about Hermite interpolation in a space of type $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$. In [4] the authors construct, only in the univariate case, the Hermite interpolant in $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$ satisfying conditions (29) by using quite different techniques, based on a differential operator (for which $\mathcal{P}^n_{u,v}([a,b])$ is the nullspace) and on the corresponding Green's function. The approximation results for such interpolant provided in [4] are in accordance with ours. In fact, the approximation order obtained under the assumptions (2) and (3) is n (see Theorem 8 in [4]). In one of the examples, where $u(s) = (1 - s/h)^\mu$, $v(s) = (s/h)^\mu$ and $[a,b] = [0,h]$ $(h > 0)$, the authors remark that there is a loss of precision if $\mu > n - 1$ when s_0 approaches 0: while the approximation order remains the same, the more s_0 gets close to 0, the more the constant appearing in the error bound grows. However, in our results, this problem never occurs since our assumptions exclude this case.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we provided a deep study of the generalized spline spaces over T-meshes, which generalize the concept of spline space over T-mesh. We showed that, in spite of the different functions locally considered, the overall behaviour of the new spline spaces is analogous to the classical polynomial case. In fact, thanks to the properties of the chosen non-polynomial functions we can use a local Bernstein-Bézier representation and generalize the arguments used in [14] to the considered non-polynomial case, to get a basis (associated to a minimal determining set) and a dimension formula. Moreover, we obtained the approximation order by considering a quasi-interpolant based on newly defined local Hermite interpolants, which is essentially the same as in the polynomial case.

Finally, in Section 4, we also provided a discussion about some noteworthy choices of the non-polynomial functions to be chosen in order to get a good behaviour with respect to differentiation and integration.

References

[1] Y. Bazilevs, V.M. Calo, J.A. Cottrell, J.A. Evans, T.J.R. Hughes, S. Lipton, M.A. Scott and T.W. Sederberg, Isogeometric analysis using T-splines, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 199, 229-263 (2010).

[2] L. Beirão da Veiga, A. Buffa, G. Sangalli and R. Vazquez, Analysis-suitable T-splines of arbitrary degree: definition and properties, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S. 23, 1979-2003 (2013).

[3] C. Bracco, D. Berdisnky, D. Cho, M. Oh and T. Kim, Trigonometric Generalized T-splines, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 268, 540-556 (2014).

[4] P. Costantini, T. Lyche, and C. Manni, On a class of weak Tchebycheff systems, Numer. Math. 101, 333-354 (2005).

[5] J.A. Cottrell, T.J.R. Hughes and Y. Bazilevs, Isogeometric Analysis: toward integration of CAD and FEA, John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

[6] J.S. Deng, F.L. Chen, and Y.Y. Feng, Dimensions of spline spaces over T-meshes, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 194, 267-283 (2006).

[7] B.I. Kvasov and P. Sattayatham, GB-splines of arbitrary order, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 104, 63-88 (1999).

[8] M.J. Lai and L.L. Schumaker, Spline functions on triangulations, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[9] C.J. Li, R.H. Wang, and F. Zhang, Improvement on the dimensions of spline spaces over T-meshes, J. Inform. Comput. Sci. 3, 235-244 (2006).

[10] X. Li, F. Chen, On the instability in the dimension of spline spaces over T-meshes, Comput. Aided. Geom. Design 28, 420-426 (2011).

[11] C. Manni, F. Pelosi and M.L. Sampoli, Generalized B-splines as a tool in isogeometric analysis, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 200, 867-881 (2011).

[12] C. Manni, F. Pelosi and H. Speleers, Local hierarchical h-refinements in IgA Based on Generalized B-splines, Lect. Notes Comput. Sc. 8177, 341-363 (2014).

[13] B. Mourrain, On the dimension of spline spaces on planar T-meshes, Math. Comp. 83, 847-871 (2014).

[14] L.L. Schumaker and L. Wang, Approximation power of polynomial splines on T-meshes, Comput. Aided Geom. Design 29, 599-612 (2012).

[15] T.W. Sederberg, J. Zheng, A. Bakenov and A. Nasri, T-splines and T-NURCCs, ACM Trans. Graph. 22 3, 477-484 (2003).

[16] T.W. Sederberg, D.L. Cardon, G.T. Finnigan, N.S. North, J. Zheng and T. Lyche, T-splines simplification and local refinement, ACM Trans. Graph. 23 3, 276-283 (2004).